

ROBERTA S. HAYASHI, CA STATE BAR NO. 105141  
MARY KATHARINE WILSON, CA STATE BAR NO. 248771  
BERLINER COHEN  
TEN ALMADEN BOULEVARD  
ELEVENTH FLOOR  
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113-2233  
TELEPHONE: (408) 286-5800  
FACSIMILE: (408) 998-5388  
roberta.hayashi@berliner.com  
kate.wilson@berliner.com

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS PCI CONSTRUCTION, INC.  
AND HAMID ADLPARVAR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FRANCISCO MAYA,

Plaintiff,

v.

PCI CONSTRUCTION, INC., HAMID  
ADLPARVAR and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C07-06047 JW/RS

DECLARATION OF MARY KATHARINE  
WILSON IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'  
CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT  
[Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-9]

Date: April 21, 2008  
Time: 10:00 AM  
Courtroom: 8  
Judge: Hon. James Ware  
Case Filed: November 29, 2007  
Trial Date: None Set

I, Mary Katharine Wilson, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed in the state of California and admitted to practice before this Court, and an associate in the firm of Berliner Cohen, attorneys for PCI Construction, Inc. and Hamid Adlparvar ("Defendants") in the above-captioned matter.

2. Counsel for Defendants received the Complaint in the above-captioned matter on March 24, 2008 and thereafter filed an Answer on behalf of Defendants on March 25, 2008.

3. After filing the Answer on March 25, 2008, I made repeated efforts to contact Mr. James Dal Bon, counsel for Francisco Maya ("Plaintiff"), via telephone at both of the firms listed in the documents filed in the above-captioned matter and the Electronic Court Filing records to

1 schedule and complete a meaningful conference pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure  
2 Rule 26(f). On March 27, 2008 counsel for Plaintiff returned my calls and indicated that he  
3 would be prepared to meet and confer regarding the above-captioned matter in a timely fashion.

4 4. Following our initial telephone conference I again made repeated efforts to  
5 contact counsel for Plaintiff via telephone in order to meet and confer and discuss the contents of  
6 a Joint Case Management Statement. While counsel for Plaintiff did return my calls on March 8,  
7 2008, and the parties agreed to stipulate to an ADR process, counsel for Plaintiff was unable to  
8 engage in a meaningful conference. However, counsel for Plaintiff agreed to contact me on  
9 March 9, 2008 to meet and confer and discuss the contents of a Joint Case Management  
10 Statement.

11 5. I received no communications from counsel for Plaintiff on March 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup>,  
12 2008 and thereafter prepared Defendants' separate Case Management Statement to ensure timely  
13 filing of the same.

14 I have personal knowledge of the facts stated above. If called as a witness, I could and  
15 would testify competently to the foregoing in a court of law. I declare under penalty of perjury  
16 under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

17  
18 DATED: APRIL 11, 2008

19  
20   
21 MARY KATHARINE WILSON